



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Those of us who honestly believe in the eventual success of world organization on the basis of justice and lasting peace have had to endure many a jibe and jeer during the last few weeks. It was because for a few days the war wolf, to use a vulgar though appropriate expression, was on the outside of the peace lamb. We were ridiculed because of the inefficiency of our cure, and chided as quacks by the very men who, bewailing the failure of the cure, persistently refuse to try our medicine. In fact, we are blamed for a failure to prevent a breach of the peace which, as everybody knows, could occur only because the world is still refusing to heed our advice. But the voice of derision has suddenly been silenced. Why? Because reason has again been enthroned and the cause of peace has been vindicated by an administration which, after all, seems sincerely to be devoted to it, and as a Republican I take my hat off—figuratively speaking—when I make this statement. But now that our Government has accepted mediation, let me remind our jingo friends that the same loyalty to the flag which prompted them and us to follow the President in his warlike course, now impels us to uphold his hands when he offers the olive branch, for if it is patriotic to risk life for the country, it is no less patriotic to preserve life for the country. I ask you in all seriousness whether or not the kind of patriotism which spells preservation is not superior to the kind of patriotism which spells destruction?

So it seems, gentlemen, that in the eyes of all thinking men the Mexican crisis, by its object-lessons, is really giving impetus to the cause of peace. We have learned that battleships are no preventive of war; on the contrary, that their very existence tends rather to provoke war. We have learned also that the most priceless possession which true civilization knows—that is, the peace of society—is still the most insecure of all. We can be robbed of it by the arbitrary will of rulers, the passions of the people, so easily inflamed by mere unforeseen accidents, or by some petty officer losing his head. Let me say again that I am not criticising, but am merely illustrating what appears to be the truth.

The question is: What are you going to do about it? If I were to answer this query—and I came here for the purpose of doing so—I would say: "Turn your backs upon the dark past, with its legalized shedding of human blood, and, as the most essential requirement of progressive thought and true civilization, erect a Temple of Justice, with permanent peace as its corner-stone." This is, in a few words, the whole aim and object of the peace movement. If the people could be made to realize that in this time or day no responsible government will wantonly insult another government; if they could be made to realize that our Government, which claims to be civilized, will act honorably in all its dealings with other governments, that it must do so in this time and age, because it is watched by millions and millions of people; if they could only be made to realize that wars of conquest are out of the question, and that trade advantages can be secured by industry and enterprise much better than by force of arms, there would be no more wars, for such convictions would inevitably lead to binding international agreements which would secure our peace as well as that of other nations against all contingencies.

Let me illustrate: Suppose we had entered into a solemn contract with Mexico and all other nations of the world that in case of difference we would have an investigation first before we commenced to fight, do you believe for one moment that at the time of the investigation—that is, at the end of twelve months—anybody would care to fight about a last year's bird's nest? Hardly. This is the plan just now explained by Secretary Bryan—the plan that is now submitted to the governments for adoption. If agreed to by them, and lived up to honestly without purpose of evasion, you can readily see that such a contract would surround peace with an impregnable safeguard, and remove it from the exposed position where it is the foot-ball of politics or the plaything of rulers, or where the merest accidents and consequent popular passions could play havoc with it in the twinkling of an eye. But this would be only the beginning. Eventually peace will be fortified—to borrow a phrase from the military lexicon—by a second line of defense, consisting of solemn treaties of arbitration and a world court as a tribunal of last resort, a final arbiter of the affairs of mankind, and an impregnable bulwark of the world's peace.

How long before this new era will dawn upon us? It will not take many Mexican wars before the people will demand it. They have learned even within the last few weeks that mediation or arbitration is a much more effectual means of settling international differences than the force of arms can possibly be, for war never settles a question of right and wrong, but only which side is the strongest. And is it worth while? You might as well ask what the sun is good for. The world is now wasting three billion dollars for armaments annually, and most of this money could be saved. Lift that tremendous burden from the backs of men, and the whole human family will heave a sigh of relief. The man in the counting-room, the workman in the shop, the toiler in the field, the miner who works deep down in the bowels of the earth—all will join in benedictions, because all will be beneficiaries alike. Relieved from a crushing burden which holds the world in bondage, all conditions—physical, moral, and economical—will improve, and in leaps and bounds the people will advance to a higher level of civilization and a more glorious destiny. Ladies and gentlemen, there is not and cannot be an issue more vital and transcendent than this before the people of the earth.

Address of Hon. Walter L. Hensley.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am indeed glad to have this opportunity to address you briefly upon a subject and in behalf of a cause the importance of which to the present as well as to future generations is vastly greater than any cause in defense of which men have offered up their lives on the field of battle. Truth and humanity are upon our side. Profit, the dollar, and commercialism, with all its sordidness, is upon the other side. The issue is joined. We understand fully its meaning. We know the far-reaching consequences to the people. Therefore, the cause is worthy the best thought and the very best and most heroic effort of which we are capable.

I ask your pardon in this connection if I speak somewhat plainly and bluntly tonight. It is my judgment that we too frequently shoot wide of the mark. Our aim is above the heads of the people whom we should affect. Now let us be practical, and give such thought to the question as will enable us to present it in a way that will insure the greatest results from our efforts. It seems to me that greater results will be obtained if we will direct our efforts toward informing the masses of our people upon this subject and arousing them to proper action. We should place the facts before them so that they will know to what end this policy will lead, and how it will affect them and their children and their children's children.

The article contributed to the *Saturday Evening Post* some months since by the worthy president of this society, the great Senator from Ohio, Senator Burton, in which he dealt with this subject in a way that can be thoroughly comprehended by anybody and everybody reading the article, has, in my judgment, done vastly more good than many, many speeches which have been made in or out of Congress upon this question. The time has arrived in the history of our country when the spirit of '76 should be stirred, and the love of country revitalized, and the people put in possession of the facts so that they can see and understand to a certainty how this question is fraught with great consequences to our country and to our people. We have many, many people crying peace, peace, and yet their conduct does not indicate a desire for peace. They are making long speeches, the theme of which is peace, but every practical movement made by these gentlemen is in opposition to our purpose as I understand it—the promotion of the peace of the world. They profess great earnestness for the cause of peace, and at the same time urge upon Congress and the people a "better state of preparedness," that hated expression which is conceived in the hearts and in the minds of those who have not the welfare of our great country at heart, but rather have in mind their own pecuniary interests. They are statesmen of the crawfish variety. They may have their eyes upon the rising sun, the rays of which mean the dawn of the day for which we all hope, but their movements, like the crawfish, are in the opposite direction.

I say to you, Mr. President, that if the American people, that great body of disinterested citizens, can be aroused so that they will study this subject; if these people who toil, who produce the wealth of this nation and of the world, who fight the battles of the nation and sustain the flag upon every field of honor, understood these facts as you and I understand them, they would most emphatically refuse to be marshaled upon the field of battle to do service for commercial reasons. They would say in tones unmistakable and certain that we are ready to contribute our last dollar and to offer up our lives to protect and to keep unsullied the principles that the flag of our country should represent as our fathers intended it should represent, but not one penny, certainly not a life of a citizen, shall we sacrifice to sustain the great commercial organizations for the purpose of exploitation of the weaker governments of the world.

I may be old-fashioned, but I believe that the Navy Department, the military establishment of the country, is maintained for the service of the country, and that the country does not exist for the glory of the military

establishment. Neither do I subscribe to the doctrine that all the honor and glory that can come to an individual is through fighting and dying upon the field of battle, for I believe that one should from day to day and throughout life labor diligently to make his country richer and better, and that in so doing he is performing a service for which he is entitled to as much credit as one who goes to battle under the stirring strains of martial music. Those of us who know how the Navy League was first originated in Germany, how the powerful influences of the Krupp interests and the government as well brought it into being, and have fostered it in order to stimulate interest and create a public opinion favorable to larger appropriations, view with some alarm the movements of this same organization in this country. The fruits of their labor are shown by the record of Congress made yesterday. I do not say that any dishonesty attaches to the membership, but this influence contributed to the result. I have been woefully grieved and cast down over the vote upon the Naval Appropriation Bill. But in the face of this experience I declare to you that all that is necessary to be done is to appeal to the people as I have urged. I have an abiding faith in the common honesty and patriotism of that body of disinterested people who sustain the country in time of peace as well as in time of war. I have said on the floor of Congress that we should appeal to the hearts and intellects of our people, and that when we find them financially interested in the proposition it is needless to deal further with them. I believe, as I have always believed, that this state of preparedness, concerning which we hear so much, incites and aggravates and brings about trouble on the part of nations as well as individuals.

The people of the nation have not the faintest idea or appreciation of the many subtle influences employed by the powerful interests of this country to influence the representatives of the people to favor these large appropriations. In my opinion, if they did understand these things to which I refer, they would not permit the continuation of it. The late Mr. Chief Justice Brewer, in a speech which should be read by every patriot in our land, pointed out that naval officers retired and on the active list, and military men residing here with their families, doing society, coming in contact with members of Congress, were rapidly transforming this Capital of the people into a military center. But it is said that these influences do not mean anything; that these officers extended these little courtesies, but that they are not intended to influence any one. That probably is true, but was not that the same argument that was made by those opposed to legislation which prohibited railroads from giving passes to Representatives?

Now, in conclusion, I desire to say that we have a spectacle presented to us which should cause us to stop and think seriously upon the situation. A great nation, a giant in strength and power, stands towering above its brothers in the western hemisphere. Quite frequently it has assumed certain jurisdiction over the conduct of its brothers for the furthering of peace and good will among them. Now we see that the big, brave, courageous brother, for cause or otherwise, has become excited and angry, the gauntlet of war has been thrown down, blood has been spilled, lives have been sacrificed, and very promptly at the crucial time three of the

smaller brothers have rushed forward, caught the big brother by the hand, and appealed to him: "Come, brother; we will lead you to a higher and a nobler ground." The big brother, impressed by the spirit of the appeal, be it said to his honor, gladly assented, and tonight a nation is hoping, yea, praying, for peace and for the glory which follows peace between all nations.

Remarks of Jackson H. Ralston.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The president has kindly referred to my association with the first case in the Hague Court. I had not intended to speak of that. I may say, however, that it had seemed as if there was practically a boycott put upon the Hague Court, for several years had gone by before its doors were opened to any case. They were opened, however, by the Pious Fund Case, which involved an issue between the United States and Mexico. I may say that when this Government said to Mexico that the matter should be put up to some special tribunal or to the Hague Court, Mexico very promptly said, "Let us go to the Hague Court."

I did not rise, however, to speak about that or any other case, but I wanted to discuss another matter within the very few minutes I shall occupy your attention. The American Peace Society is eighty-six years old, as we are told. Within that time it has, of course, done a great work in the way of education, in the way of propaganda, and for many years to come it will be possible to continue that work. But something more, in my judgment, is necessary. Propaganda work has, after all, a certain academic nature. It does not appeal to the imaginations of men; it does not appeal to their hearts to a large degree, and it is not that concrete, practical application which so often appeals to the American mind. It is a good thing by way of preparing the groundwork; but if we would exercise anything like an important influence on the events of today, more than mere propaganda, in my judgment, is needed. There are concrete, practical questions coming up all the time, and we are not altogether meeting them. You may address multitudes of men gathered together in different places on the subject of peace, and they will applaud you for a moment, and they will go away and forget in the course of a very short time the substance of what has been said to them. You must ask men to do something. You must have their energies directed to certain important, definite propositions. That, at least, is my judgment with regard to the matter.

What are these things to be? The general nature of some of them has been indicated by the speeches that have been made. Others will suggest themselves to you. It is, or ought to be, made absolutely illegitimate for a nation to sell armament to another nation. I look upon it as a high crime to sell armament to a nation which is at war. It ought to be illegitimate for one nation to be able through its citizens to subscribe to the bonds of another nation engaged or proposing to engage in war, knowing that the bonds are issued for that purpose.

These things, as I see them, appeal to me as being absolutely necessary. I have yet, however, to see that

any member of Congress has addressed himself—I mean through the introduction of bills in Congress—to those things which, to my mind, have a supreme value from the standpoint of peace. I think this should be done. We must, I say, be able to throw the whole body of peace sentiment in favor of practical, concrete propositions which may be brought before Congress. You don't know how many real peace people there are in the world until you present to them a practical proposition.

Let me close what I have to say by calling attention to the fact that, while in the House of Representatives we have our Military Committee and Naval Committee, we have no Peace Committee to which such propositions should properly go and by which they should properly be considered. I conceive of nothing more useful, so far as general propaganda is concerned, than to have a Peace Committee in Congress, whether it be on the nomination of this society or of members of Congress, and this committee should be authorized to advise the House of Representatives relative to all propositions having a practical bearing upon the general campaign for peace.

Remarks of Senator John Sharp Williams.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

"Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers." The Secretary of State has recalled to my mind the old adage: "The thoughts of God multiply very slowly in the hearts of men."

I do not for my own part doubt but that as we go along living our national lives, overcoming international obstacles of one sort or another, we become better fitted for the peace of tomorrow. So far from believing that the best way to prepare for peace is to prepare for war, I think that the best way while in a state of peace to get more peace, or to continue the peace we have, is to accumulate the munitions of peace, and the munitions of peace consist largely of knowledge and mutual respect.

It seems to me that if we are to be prepared for war in order that we may have peace we are going back internationally to the pioneer condition that existed among individuals in my own country at one time. Every man carried a six-shooter, and it was universally believed that a man was more apt to avoid having any fighting to do if he had a six-shooter than if he did not have a six-shooter. After awhile it was found out, however, that whenever there was a dispute one would shoot quick because the other might shoot quicker. Thus going prepared for war brought on war.

To go back to the Tennysonian couplet, "Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers," you have all the knowledge about the evils of war you want. There is Norman Angell's "Great Illusion," the book on "War and Waste," etc. You know that war means hell—hell on men, women, business, civilization, morals, education, good neighborhood, and everything else. You don't need any more knowledge on that subject—nobody needs that. Even Sherman confessed it. You are not going to bring about a state of peace by getting any more knowledge of that kind. Every one knows that war is not only criminal, but foolish, idiotic, insane. There is